

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-2560

NAJIA RAHMANI,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RESORTS INTERNATIONAL HOTEL, INCORPORATED;
BOARDWALK REGENCY CORPORATION,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T.S. Ellis, III, District Judge. (CA-98-205-A)

Submitted: June 29, 1999

Decided: July 8, 1999

Before WILLIAMS, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Barry Coburn, COBURN & SCHERTLER, Washington, D.C.; Karl G. Feissner, Upper Marlboro, Maryland, for Appellant. Michael J. Klisch, Robert T. Cahill, MCGUIRE, WOODS, BATTLE & BOOTH, L.L.P., McLean, Virginia; Hugh P. Quinn, ROSENMAN & COLIN, L.L.P., Washington, D.C.; Daniel Schiffman, SCHIFFMAN & FRANK, New York, New York, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Najia Rahmani appeals the dismissal of her complaint and amended complaint against two New Jersey casinos alleging several claims and seeking the recovery of over \$3,000,000 in gambling losses. The district court granted motions to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) filed by Appellees Resorts International Hotel, Incorporated, and Boardwalk Regency Corporation. On appeal, Rahmani raises four claims: (1) the casinos owed a duty not to encourage her to gamble or offer complimentary services in exchange for her gambling; (2) contracts made between her and the casinos should be rescinded and her gambling losses restored to her; (3) the alleged forgery of documents by one casino constituted intentional affliction of emotional distress; and (4) the district court abused its discretion in denying her motion to amend her complaint. We have reviewed the briefs, the joint appendix, and the district court orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Rahmani v. Resorts Int'l Hotel, Inc., No. CA-98-205-A (E.D. Va. July 22 & Sept. 28, 1998).^{*} We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

^{*} Although the district court orders were marked as "filed" on July 17, 1998, and September 25, 1998, the district court records show that the orders were not entered on the docket sheet until July 22, 1998, and September 28, 1998 respectively. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the orders were entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decisions. See Wilson v. Murray, 860 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid in the decisional process.

AFFIRMED